

REMARKS

The Applicant has now had an opportunity to carefully consider the comments set forth in the Office Action mailed August 28, 2006 as well as the comments of the Examiner, which were provided during the telephone interview of October 3, 2006. The allowance of claims 9-15, 19-25 and 31-36 and the recognition of allowable subject matter in claims 3-5, 7 and 28 is noted with appreciation. However, all of the rejections are respectfully traversed. Amendment, reexamination and reconsideration of the application are respectfully requested.

The Office Action

In the Office Action mailed August 28, 2006:

claims 9-15, 19-25 and 31-36 were allowed;

claims 3-5, 7 and 28 were recognized as including allowable subject matter;

claims 1-2, 6, 8, 26-27 and 29-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable in view of three references including U.S. Patent No. 6,259,283 B1 to Tewani, et al. ("Tewani"), U.S. Patent No. 5,953,663 to Maupin, et al. ("Maupin") and U.S. Patent No. 6,625,273 B1 to Ashdown, et al. ("Ashdown"); and

claims 16-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over a combination of four references including Tewani, Maupin and Ashdown in further view of U.S. Patent No. 7,054,652 B2 to Luis ("Luis").

Telephone Interview Summary

The participation of the Examiner, Ms. Olivia Marsh, in a telephone interview with Mr. Thomas Tillander, one of the representatives of the Applicant, on or about October 3, 2006 is noted with appreciation. The interview was directed toward the newly cited Luis reference and **claim 16** of the present application. **Claim 17** was also briefly mentioned. Mr. Tillander directed the attention of the Examiner to portions of the present application that discuss aspects of the --timed forward call indicator message-- recited in **claim 16** and asserted that Luis did not disclose or suggest a message including these aspects. The Examiner agreed that Luis does not disclose a message including a bit that indicates whether routing information came from a local cache or from a number portability database. Mr. Tillander submitted that Luis also does not disclose or suggest a message including time information indicating an age of local

cache data. Possible amendments were discussed. No agreement was reached.

The Claims are not Obvious

Claims 1-2, 6, 8, 26-27 and 29-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tewani, Maupin, and further in view of Ashdown.

However, even if there were a motivation to combine Tewani, Maupin and Ashdown (which is disputed), and even if the references included all the subject matter for which they are relied upon (which is also disputed), in order for the allowed claims to issue as a patent, certain of the claims have been canceled and others have been amended to depend from allowed claims.

In this regard, **claim 1** has been canceled. Subject matter from **claim 2** has been combined with subject matter from **claim 6** in an amendment to **claim 6**. Accordingly, **claim 2** has been canceled. **Claim 6** has been amended to depend from **claim 3**, which has been found to include allowable subject matter, and which has been placed in independent form. **Claim 8** has also been amended to depend from **claim 3**. **Claims 26 and 27** have been canceled. **Claims 29 and 30** have also been canceled.

Accordingly, the rejections of **claims 1-2, 6, 8, 26-27 and 29-30** are moot.

Claims 16-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tewani in view of Maupin in view of Ashdown and further in view of Luis.

However, the Office Action relies on Luis for disclosure of a timed forward call indicator message. A timed forward call indicator message (timed FCI) is discussed throughout the present specification including FIG. 10 and, for example, paragraphs 47, 82 and 87-97. It is respectfully submitted that Luis, including column 12, lines 1-10, cited by the Office Action, does not disclose or suggest a timed forward call indicator message as recited in **claim 16**. Furthermore, it is respectfully submitted that Luis does not disclose or suggest a timed forward call indicator message including at least one of a local routing number segment, a call party number segment, timed forward call indicator bit and a time information segment, wherein the local routing number segment is based on the stored routing information, where the timed forward call indicator bit indicates stored routing information is provided in the timed forward call indicator message, wherein the time information segment is based on the time information associated with the stored routing information, as recited in **claim 17**. Accordingly, Luis does not include the subject matter for which it is relied and **claims 16 and 17** are not

obvious in light of the combination of four references including Tewani, Maupin, Ashdown and Luis.

Furthermore, **claim 16** has been returned to dependent form and has been amended to depend from **claim 3**. **Claim 3** has been found to include allowable subject matter and has been placed in independent form.

For at least the foregoing reasons, **claim 16**, as well as **claim 17**, which depends therefrom, is not anticipated and is not obvious in light of Tewani, Maupin, Ashdown and Luis.

The Claims that were Objected to

Claims 3-5, 7 and 28 were objected to for depending from rejected base claims.

However, allowable subject matter from **claim 7** has been included, by amendment, in allowable **claim 3**, and **claim 3** has been placed in independent form including all of the subject matter of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 4, 5 and 28 have also been placed in independent form including all of the subject matter from their respective original base claims and any intervening claims.

Since subject matter from **claim 7** has been included in **claim 3**, **claim 7** has been canceled.

For at least the foregoing reasons, **claims 3-5 and 28** are allowable.

The New Claims

New **claims 37 and 38** recite subject matter similar to that recited in amended **claim 6** but depend from allowable **claims 4 and 5**, respectively. Accordingly, **claims 37 and 38** are not anticipated and are not obvious in view of Tewani, Maupin, Ashdown and Luis.

New **claims 39 and 40** recite subject matter similar to subject matter recited in **claims 16 and 17**. However, **claim 39** depends from allowable **claim 4**, and **claim 40** depends from **claim 39**.

For at least the foregoing additional reasons, **claims 39 and 40** are not anticipated and are not obvious in light of Tewani, Maupin, Ashdown and Luis.

New **claims 41 and 42** also recite subject matter similar to **claims 16 and 17**, respectively. However, **claim 41** depends from allowable **claim 5**, and **claim 42** depends from **claim 41**.

For at least the foregoing reasons, **claims 41 and 42** are not anticipated and are not obvious in light of Tewani, Maupin, Ashdown and Luis.

Claims 43 and 44 recite subject matter similar to that recited in **claim 18**. However, **claims 43 and 44** depend from allowable **claims 4 and 5**, respectively.

For at least reasons, new **claims 43 and 44** are not anticipated and are not obvious in light of Tewani, Maupin, Ashdown and Luis.

Telephone Interview

In the interests of advancing this application to issue, the Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner telephone the undersigned to discuss the foregoing or any suggestions that the Examiner may have to place the case in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

Claims 3-6, 9-25, 28 and 31-36 remain in the application. **Claims 1, 2, 7, 26, 27, 29 and 30** have been canceled. **Claims 3, 4, 5, 6, 16 and 28** have been amended. **Claims 37-44** have been added. For at least the reasons, the application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly and early indication thereof is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

FAY, SHARPE, FAGAN,
MINNICH & McKEE, LLP


October 24, 2006
Date


Joseph D. Dreher, Reg. No. 37,123
Thomas Tillander, Reg. No. 47,334
1100 Superior Avenue, Seventh Floor
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-2579
216-861-5582

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION

Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.8, I certify that this Amendment is being

- ☒ deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class mail, addressed to Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date indicated below.
☐ transmitted via facsimile in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.8 on the date indicated below.
☐ deposited with the United States Postal Service "Express Mail Post Office to Addressee" service under 37 C.F.R. 1.10, addressed to Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date indicated below.

Express Mail Label No.:	Signature 
Date <u>October 24, 2006</u>	Printed Name Iris E. Weber

N:\LUTZ\200305\US\IEW0004991\V001.doc